

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

MEETING



Tuesday, 5 December 1972,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Hady TOURÉ (Guinea).

AGENDA ITEM 42

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories (*continued*) (A/8828, A/SPC/158, A/SPC/L.258)

1. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Special Committee's report (A/8828) represented a commendable effort to keep Member States informed about grave violations of international law. The fact that the Special Committee had been unable to carry out an on-site investigation had not in any way prevented it from performing its duties in an impartial manner, since the Israeli authorities no longer made a secret of their annexationist designs in the occupied territories. Almost all the evidence submitted by the Special Committee on annexation and settlement was based on official Israeli statements, while the Special Committee had drawn extensively upon reports by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) with regard to deportation, demolition of houses and transfers of population.

2. As the only body competent to keep the United Nations informed on developments affecting human rights in the occupied territories, the Special Committee was needed now more than ever and should remain in existence as long as the occupation continued. At the same time, urgent steps should be taken to protect the human rights and interests of the population of the occupied territories. That was why the Special Committee had recommended on several occasions that ICRC should assume the functions of a Protecting Power. Unless it was clearly understood that the fulfilment of the Zionist State remained predicated upon the massive denial of Arab rights, there was a danger that mere palliatives rather than cures would be applied. The Special Committee's appeals for the establishment of machinery to supervise the implementation of international law in relation to human rights in the occupied territories had not fallen on deaf ears. However, Israel had continued to repudiate its obligations under the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (the fourth Geneva Convention) of 12 August 1949.¹ At the 849th meeting the Israeli representative had once

again stated his Government's view that article 49 of the Convention did not apply; that was a clear case of repudiation of obligations assumed under the Charter and under international law.

3. In permitting the International Committee of the Red Cross to function in the occupied territories while denying that the fourth Geneva Convention applied, Israel was permitting that Committee to function outside the framework of the Convention, so that even if Israel agreed to the assumption by ICRC of the role of Protecting Power, it would not be doing so under the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention. That was tantamount to accepting the jurisdiction of a court while rejecting the laws which it applied. It reminded his delegation of the pre-1967 armistice situation. Israel had availed itself of the services of the United Nations military observers while boycotting the Mixed Armistice Commission and repudiating its obligations under the General Armistice Agreement of 1949,² with the result that the demilitarized zones between Israel and Syria had been gradually annexed by Israel before the very eyes of the United Nations representatives.

4. The crux of the matter was that despite the reports of ICRC, Israel had violated articles 49, 52, 53 and 54 of the fourth Geneva Convention. The 120,000 inhabitants of the Golan Heights in Syria had been evicted during and after the war. The destruction of Arab towns and villages was continuing in that area, and 17 Israeli colonies had been established. He wondered how any machinery set up under the fourth Geneva Convention to protect the interests of the population of the occupied territories could function when the people in question were being prevented from returning to their homes and camps, as was confirmed by ICRC reports describing the Golan Heights as a territory emptied of its population. Since Israel's basic objectives were territorial expansion and annexation, that country would obviously never recognize the applicability of any convention that dealt with territorial matters.

5. Since any machinery set up under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 would be unable to function properly unless Israel agreed to apply the Convention without any reservations and since the current system of investigation and protection had not brought about Israeli compliance with the provisions of the Convention, particularly those relating to transfers of population, annexation and settlement, an alternative solution could be found only within the functions and powers

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 42 (1949), No. 657.

of the Security Council. There was nothing to prevent the Council from establishing a subsidiary organ of its own to keep watch over the implementation of its resolutions 237 (1967), 259 (1968) and 298 (1971). That would represent a real deterrent to Israeli violations of international law and would be a first step towards applying the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter if Israel did not desist from its violations. In the meantime, however, both the Special Committee and ICRC should continue their efforts.

6. The Israeli representative's statement at the 849th meeting, although it distorted the facts, deserved the Committee's attention both for what it said and for what it avoided saying. The Israeli representative sought to depict the occupation and annexation of a territory as a practice which was in no sense contrary to international law, whereas in fact it represented a return to barbarism and to nineteenth-century colonialism. That representative had tried to portray the occupation and annexation of Arab territories as not unlike an aid programme, he expected the international community to regard the occupation of land belonging to three States Members of the United Nations as having political, social and economic value and would like Israel's absorption of Arab territories and resources to be regarded as a generous concession to the international community. It was, however, nothing but colonialism. The Special Committee, especially in paragraphs 75, 76 and 77 of its report (A/8828), had ably explained the real meaning of Israel's claims regarding improvements in the economic situation in the occupied territories and had placed the material conditions prevailing in those territories in their proper context, which was economic exploitation; that was clear from the last part of paragraph 75 of the report.

7. The Israeli representative's statement deserved attention not only for what it said but also for what it failed to say. His delegation would supply the facts concerning the Golan Heights which the Israeli representative had chosen to pass over in silence. It would use for that purpose the reports presented by the Zionist Agricultural Settlement Department and the Settlement Division the World Zionist Organization at the twenty-eighth World Zionist Congress in Jerusalem. The report of the first of those bodies had said *inter alia*:

"The outcome of the six-day war directly affected settlement in Israel.... The phenomenon is a blessing for both the settler and the State, since it means increased income, higher standards of living, lower production costs and better export possibilities.... In addition, the department is developing other sources of non-agricultural employment, such as holiday resorts and suitable industrial enterprises." The second report was even more specific, stating as follows:

"After the six-day war the Government decided to establish settlements in the administered territories.... The new division had to ... create new kinds of settlement utilizing the natural resources of the respective areas. Production was geared to export or to replacing agricultural imports which had to be

paid for in hard currency. The guiding line was to develop industry in sectors which could contribute to economic independence without adversely affecting production in existing settlements. The new settlement activities were centred in four main areas: the Golan Heights, the Jordan Valley Basin, the Etzion Block and Sinai.... The ... division prepared a master plan for the Golan, including, apart from the means of agricultural production, development of services, holiday facilities and industry.... The master plan holds that a total of between 17 and 20 settlements can be established on the Golan, including the 13 that have already been set up. The plan also points to the possibility of building a regional town which would help populate the area quickly."

He noted the date of establishment, the name of the founding movement and the social structure in the case of the 15 settlements established in the Golan Heights, which were listed in paragraph 28 of the Special Committee's report. The names of two settlements which were in the process of being established, Nov and Hispin, should be added to that list. He noted that, in an article published in *Ha'aretz* on 2 June 1972, Mr. Abba Eban had acknowledged, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the 1967 war, that Israel had benefited from its aggression and annexation since it had been able to admit more Jewish immigrants, increase its national product and its exports and attract more tourists.

8. The international community could not and should not remain silent in the face of a situation in which the use of force, the acquisition of territory by force and settler colonialism had become instruments of national aggrandizement. The United Nations must take immediate action to end Israeli aggression and eliminate its consequences. The Security Council should shake itself out of its meditative mood and impose severe sanctions on Israel, for it was clear by now that Israel could not be deterred unless it was severely punished. Israel's membership in the United Nations must also be reviewed.

9. It was incumbent upon all Member States to respect their obligations under the Charter and to fulfil them in good faith, particularly their obligation not to recognize the consequences of resort to force. His Government would always determine the nature of its relations with other States in the light of their respect for the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force. The corollary of that principle was that States must refrain from any action that would assist, support or perpetuate Israeli occupation. The liberation of the occupied territories was not a privilege but a right which the Syrian Arab Republic would never relinquish.

10. His delegation appealed to the Government of the United States of America to stop supporting and protecting Israel's occupation and colonization of Arab territory. On the basis of facts and statistics, the Arabs considered that the United States bore a special responsibility for the continuation of the Israeli occupation. But the United States would be wrong to believe that the Arabs and the Palestinians were not capable of recovering their rights to their territory.

11. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, as confirmed in the Special Committee's report, since Israel's war of aggression of 1967, the international community had tried to no avail to dissuade it from continuing its policy of annexing the territories that had illegally come under its control. After examining the cumulative effect of the measures adopted by Israel, the Special Committee had expressed its conviction that, irrespective of the intention of the occupying Power, the practices and policies referred to were such that the international community would be faced with a *fait accompli*, in other words with a situation that might prove irreversible, namely, the incorporation of the occupied territories or their annexation to the State of Israel.

12. While the General Assembly in its resolution 2851 (XXVI) had called upon Israel to permit all persons who had fled the occupied territories or had been deported or expelled therefrom to return to their homes, the Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan, had stated that Israel would not permit the return of the hundreds of thousands of West Bank residents who had left the country before or during the six-day war (*The Jerusalem Post*, 13 June 1972). What was more alarming was that Israel was deliberately continuing to drive out the remaining population of the occupied territories to make room for alien emigrant Jews. According to Israel Galili, Chairman of the Ministerial Committee for the Settlement of the Occupied Territories, the Government of Israel had put no area out of bounds for Jewish settlement; on 3 July 1972, 45 settlements had been established in the occupied territories. That policy of establishing Jewish settlements in Jerusalem, Hebron, the Jordan Valley, the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip and in Sinai, in particular at Sharm El-Sheikh, was part of a comprehensive Zionist plan to absorb and integrate all the territories acquired by conquest and aggression. Israel had not concealed its intention of retaining eastern Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, Sharm El-Sheikh and the Gaza Strip (see A/8828, paras. 26 to 28).

13. Israel must withdraw from the territories it had occupied in 1967; it must be forced to refrain from establishing Jewish settlements in the occupied territories, discontinue its sordid policies of mass transfer of civilian populations which it continued to pursue in violation of article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2546 (XXIV), to desist forthwith from its repressive practices and policies towards the civilian population in the occupied territories and comply with its obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant resolutions adopted by the various international organizations. It was high time for the international community to act in order to serve the cause of justice and peace. Israel would be wrong to assume that the acquisition of Arab territory would go unchallenged; the Arab countries would never capitulate or forfeit their lands.

14. Mr. DZULKIFLI (Malaysia) said that, despite the difficulties encountered by the Special Committee,

it had given a factual report, which removed any doubts as to the existence of violations of the human rights of the people in the Israeli-occupied territories. It was a pity that the Special Committee had been unable to conduct its investigation directly on the spot because of the refusal of the Israeli Government to co-operate and even to receive it. That attitude even gave the impression that the Israeli authorities had something to hide. His delegation was gravely concerned over the welfare and future of the population of the occupied territories; moving persons from their homes to other parts of the occupied territories, expropriating property, demolishing houses, establishing settlements, moving Israeli nationals into those settlements and denying people their right to return constituted a systematic policy aimed at the elimination of every vestige of Palestinian presence in the areas, the obvious motive for which was the perpetuation of Israel's hold on the territories acquired by force.

15. The crux of the Middle East problem was the just solution of the Palestinian problem; they were the people who were being humiliated, oppressed, deprived of their inalienable rights and systematically eliminated from the territories under foreign occupation. It was the international community's duty to spare no effort to reach an acceptable and just solution to the problem and to remove forever the danger it represented to international peace and security.

16. The Special Committee had of course admitted, in paragraph 90 of its report, that it was still unable to reach a conclusive finding, which would only be possible after a free investigation carried out inside the occupied territories, but it could safely be deduced from the ICRC report and the measures listed in paragraph 91 of the Special Committee's own report that violations of human rights had been committed. His delegation opposed the acquisition of territories by force and had always maintained that the Israeli occupation of the territories thus acquired must end immediately; that would constitute an important step towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Finally, Malaysia wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.258.

17. Mr. BÁNYÁSZ (Hungary) said that the Special Committee's report was an excellent working paper which, despite the isolated charges against it, bore witness to the political morals and intellectual integrity of its authors. The lecture given by the Israeli delegation had tried to prove that Israel was the best of all occupying Powers and that amid its efforts at annexation, it was ceaselessly engaged in easing the life of the Arab population and providing for its well-being and happiness. Even when the Israelis demolished Arab settlements, arrested and expelled so-called "agitators", changed the demographical composition of the occupied territories and repressed the culture of the original inhabitants of Palestine, they were apparently actually doing it in the interests of the Arabs. It might well be asked whether in the past there had ever been a single colonizing Power which had not given the propagation of culture as a pretext for occupying alien lands and oppressing

alien peoples, which had not tried, by every means of propaganda, to prove that the peoples of its colonies should be grateful for the modernization of production, the construction of schools and hospitals and which had not invoked "security reasons" to explain its refusal to respect the principles adopted to protect the civilian population.

18. Referring to one of the favourite subjects of Israeli propaganda—the anti-Israeli agitators "sent from abroad"—he reminded the Committee that during the Nazi occupation, the Government of the Third Reich had attributed every popular action to "the new Fascist order" and every guerrilla operation and political leaflet to the subversive activity of "foreign agitators". All those fighting for the liberation of their country, all the patriots willing to make sacrifices for their country, were called foreign agitators. What was revolting in itself was foreign occupation and oppression. As long as the Israeli occupation continued, there would be "agitators": those who thought only of liberating their country and their people. The Israelis could expel, arrest and torture them, but it could not reduce them to silence.

19. The moral capital and prestige of the United Nations depended on how effectively it could prevent crimes from being committed against any people anywhere in the world; in fact, it was also in the interest of the Israeli people, the workers, peasants and intellectuals to put an end to the aggressive policy of their Government. His delegation believed that the Special Committee should continue its activity, with the support of every Member State, Israel included, and with all the respect it had earned, and that the Secretariat should ensure that its activities and the incontestable facts it brought to light were given due international publicity.

20. Mr. KANOUTÉ (Mali) said that, despite the difficulties it had encountered, the Special Committee had fulfilled its mandate effectively; all the reports it had submitted were based on information provided by Governments, ICRC, Israeli newspapers and official statements by members of the Government and other Israeli authorities. It must be pointed out to those who might tend to doubt the integrity and impartiality of the Special Committee that the latter had recognized that there had been a slight relaxation in the security measures and that despite the evidence collected, it had been careful not to express a definite opinion on the ill-treatment of detainees.

21. His delegation was deeply concerned at the serious, repeated violations of the human rights of the civilian population in the occupied territories. Despite the pressing appeals made to it, in particular in Security Council resolutions 237 (1967) and 259 (1968) and General Assembly resolution 2851 (XXVI), the Israeli Government continued to establish Israeli settlements, to transfer populations by force, to expropriate property, demolish houses, deport people from the occupied territories, to refuse civilians the right to return to their homes and to continue the ill-treatment of detainees, all practices which constituted grave violations

of the Geneva Conventions and which had been called by the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 3 (XXVIII),³ "war crimes and an affront to humanity". Those measures, which Israel tried to justify by invoking reasons of security, in fact constituted a true policy of annexation and were aimed at affecting radical changes in the physical character and demographic composition of the occupied territories and at eradicating any Palestinian national identity and presence from the area.

22. Furthermore, Israel continued to scorn the resolutions and decisions adopted by the various United Nations bodies and had never agreed to co-operate with the Special Committee or even to allow it access to the occupied territories. That attitude was possible only because certain Member States repudiated their obligations under the Charter and encouraged Israel by their votes in the United Nations. It was that lack of political will—indeed, the presence of political ill will—on the part of certain Member States that had brought on the grave crisis of authority and prestige which the United Nations was currently undergoing. The international community could not and must not remain indifferent to the plight of the civilian population of the territories occupied by Israel. Every effort must be made to ensure that human rights and fundamental freedoms were respected and that the population was treated in accordance with the provisions of the third and fourth Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other relevant international instruments. He recalled that ICRC had stated that it was prepared to take upon itself all the tasks envisaged for the Protecting Power in terms of the Geneva Conventions: close attention should accordingly be given to the Special Committee's recommendation for the provision of machinery for the direct supervision of the implementation of the international law pertaining to the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, particularly the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention, which had been ratified by all the parties concerned and which was entirely applicable to the territories occupied by Israel.

23. Mr. MIKUCKI (Poland) expressed his appreciation to the Special Committee for its thorough examination of the available evidence and for the objectivity and impartiality with which it had approached its task. His delegation shared the opinion of those who considered that the Special Committee had discharged honourably the task assigned to it by the General Assembly.

24. There was nothing new in the fact that the Israeli Government had denied the validity of the General Assembly resolutions relating to the establishment or the continuation of the mandate of the Special Committee, nor in the fact that Israel had refused to co-operate with the Special Committee, having condemned the conclusions of the Special Committee even before the latter had begun its inquiries. On the basis of the evidence submitted in the Special Committee's report,

³ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 7, chap. XIII.*

it was clear that since June 1967 the Israeli Government had pursued a policy and practices which violated the Charter, international law and United Nations resolutions relating to the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. The available evidence indicated that, since December 1971, the violation of human rights in the occupied territories had become even more manifest.

25. His delegation shared the opinion expressed by other delegations that the occupation itself constituted the fundamental violation of human rights of the population of the occupied territories, even if it was accompanied by the violation of the principles of international law laid down in the fourth Geneva Convention. The annexation of territories, the establishment of settlements, the transfer of population, the expropriation of property, the demolition of houses, the deportations, the denial of the right to return and the ill-treatment of detainees were all Israeli practices which met with his Government's disapproval and indignation.

26. His delegation shared the Special Committee's view (see A/8828, paras. 83 and 86) that the evidence received reflected a policy on the part of the Government of Israel designed to effect radical changes in the physical character and demographic composition of several areas of the territories under its occupation by the deliberate eradication of the Palestinian presence in those areas. It was obvious that Israel's policy and practices were aimed at incorporating into the State of Israel some areas of the occupied territories. That policy was not only illegal and unacceptable; it was also dangerous, for it jeopardized the possibility of a peaceful solution of the Middle East problem.

27. The position of the Polish Government on the Middle East problem was well known. His delegation fully endorsed the conclusions of the Special Committee's report (*ibid.*, paras. 83 to 89). It was ready to support any resolution aimed at putting an immediate end to Israel's policy and practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories.

28. Mr. LECLERCQ (France) said that the position of his delegation was well known. Whether in the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council or the Commission on Human Rights, it had constantly expressed support for resolutions and recommendations aimed at improving the plight of the victims of events in the Middle East, and it was opposed as a matter of principle to the acquisition of territories by force. Until such time as a just and lasting peace was established, on the basis of the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which, *inter alia*, provided for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories, it considered that, currently, the strict application of the Geneva Conventions was a necessity. The fourth Geneva Convention stipulated that the occupying Power could not infringe the legitimate rights of peoples. Yet the reports of both the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East indicated the re-

grettable and sometimes illegal nature of the acts carried out by the Israeli authorities in the occupied territories; in particular, the policy aimed at "Judaizing" and integrating the Arab city of Jerusalem violated Security Council resolutions.

29. But it was clear that, in the establishment of the facts, the sources of information must be fully reliable. While the competence of ICRC and UNRWA was unanimously recognized, that of other bodies was debatable, with the result that their moral authority was undermined. His delegation thought that such was the case with the Special Committee, established under General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII), particularly since the Security Council had just entrusted a special representative of the Secretary-General with a similar mission. The legitimacy of the Special Committee was open to question and, furthermore, the proliferation of missions of inquiry gave rise to some confusion and even threatened to harm the cause they claimed to serve, in so far as such missions were not all equally qualified and their objectivity equally assured. His delegation would be guided by its concern for basic common sense and realism in taking a position on draft resolution A/SPC/L.258. Its reservations were dictated by the desire to seek the most appropriate means to ensure respect for the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. Moreover, it considered that Israel's actions which ran counter to United Nations resolutions and international law merely increased resentment and tension, jeopardizing the chances of a peaceful settlement which, in the interests of all parties concerned, the international community hoped would prevail.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that Malaysia, Afghanistan and Indonesia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.258.

AGENDA ITEM 38

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*)* (A/8666 and Corr.1, A/8670, A/8689, A/8703, paras. 501-519; A/SPC/157, A/SPC/L.257, A/SPC/L.259):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8722 and Add.1 and 2, A/8770 and Add.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8822, A/8833)

31. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the agenda item relating to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, in connexion with which the representative of India, the *Rapporteur* of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, would introduce draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, entitled "International Conference of Trade Unions against *Apartheid*".

32. Mr. AHMAD (India) recalled that the proposal for an international trade union conference had first been made at the twenty-fifth session (710th meeting) by the then Chairman of the Special Committee on

* Resumed from the 834th meeting.

Apartheid, supported by the representative of India. Since then, the Special Committee had held consultations to secure agreement on the organization of a conference with the widest participation of trade unionists from all parts of the world. The consultations had, in addition, promoted greater activity by trade unions against *apartheid*. By its resolution 2202 A (XXI) the General Assembly had authorized the Special Committee to promote an international campaign against *apartheid*, and the Special Committee had been entrusted with a key role in that campaign. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, which he was introducing on behalf of the sponsors, underlined the hope that the action of workers all over the world would help the African workers to achieve their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.

33. The preamble to the draft resolution needed no explanation, for there was no doubt as to the effectiveness of concerted action against *apartheid* by the trade union movements at the national and international level. In that connexion, attention should be drawn to the recent strike by African dockers in Natal who had demanded better working conditions and wages. It was worth reminding those who spoke highly of how much the conditions of the African workers had improved that the dockers' basic wage was R 8.50 per week, while the official poverty line was R18. Moreover, they were required to work overtime when necessary up to a total of 78 hours per week, including Sundays; it would actually be necessary for them to work 78 hours to earn R18. Nearly 1,200 dockers, whose demands were supported by the Wages Commission of the Students' Representative Council at the University of Natal, had walked out on 23 October 1972, but the strike had been broken by 24 October. On 25 October the Durban dockers and about 1,500 Cape Town dockers had refused to work overtime and had left work at 5 p.m. There, too, the strike had soon been ended. However, the Trade Union Council of South Africa had called upon employers to increase the dockers' wages, and, on 27 October, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions had sent an appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intercede with the South African Government on behalf of the dockers, whom it supported in their strike against unjust and highly discriminatory working conditions. The General Secretary of the International Confederation had added that the International Transport Workers Federation had sent a cable to Prime Minister Vorster affirming that such strikes were the inevitable consequence of the denial of trade union rights and expressing the hope that employers would respond fairly instead of taking harsh measures which solved nothing and would merely increase unrest in the future.

34. To quote the last preambular paragraph of the draft, the General Assembly would note with satisfaction the readiness of the ILO to provide conference services for the meetings and, in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, it would welcome the decision taken by the Workers' Group at the International Labour Conference to convene, in 1973, an international conference of trade unions, as well as the constructive attitude of the

main international trade union organizations in that regard. Operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 dealt with the mechanics and financing of the proposed Conference; operative paragraph 5 would authorize the Special Committee to participate effectively in the meeting of the Preparatory Committee, by operative paragraph 6 it would request the Secretary-General to provide appropriate assistance, and by operative paragraph 7 authorize the Secretary-General to reimburse the costs necessary to enable five representatives of trade union organizations from southern Africa to participate in the Conference, a matter to which his delegation attached great importance. Since the *apartheid* system had been imposed in Namibia and was also enforced in Southern Rhodesia, it was indeed appropriate that trade unions in all territories in southern Africa should be represented in the Conference and that it should consider the grave situation created in Namibia by the illegal South African régime; that régime had introduced there an inhuman migratory labour system which was a matter of concern to all the trade unions, and his delegation trusted that the Special Committee on *Apartheid* would keep in touch with the United Nations Council for Namibia during the preparations for the Conference.

35. *Apartheid* was repugnant to the fundamental principles of trade unionism. The trade unions of the world could not stand idly by when the exercise of trade union rights was denied to the majority of workers in South Africa or when, to the detriment of their own interests, whole factories were moved to South Africa to profit from *apartheid* and South African industries exported their products to world markets. The trade unions could do much to ensure the success of economic sanctions against South Africa. In June 1972, when the delegation of the Special Committee had held consultations with the Workers' Group at the International Labour Conference, the South African Congress of Trade Unions, which was strongly opposed to *apartheid* and allied with the African National Congress, had fully supported the proposals of the Special Committee and had requested all trade unions to participate in the proposed Conference. The General Secretary of the Trade Union Council of South Africa, a white trade union body with 200,000 members which was opposed to *apartheid*, had also been present at the ILO Conference. On his return to South Africa, he had declared that the determination of Governments, employers and trade unionists throughout the world to destroy *apartheid* had never been stronger. He had stressed that both the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the World Federation of Trade Unions were supporting the proposed Conference and that the entire trade union movement would be ranged against South Africa in a common effort to destroy the *apartheid* system.

36. The Organization of African Unity had affirmed, in the Lusaka Manifesto (Manifesto on Southern Africa⁴) which it had adopted in 1969 and which had

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

been unanimously endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 2505 (XXIV), that South Africa should be ostracized by the world community and left to be self-sufficient if it could, and that the South African Government could not be allowed both to reject the very concept of mankind's unity and to benefit by the strength given through friendly international relations.

37. The sponsors of the draft resolution were proposing, as a matter of priority, that an international conference of trade unions against *apartheid* be convened, with the support of the ILO, and hoped that, in 1973, the Committee would be able to consider convening a conference of writers, artists, doctors, scientists and journalists organized with the support of UNESCO.

38. The quasi-unanimity reflecting the mass support given by the international community to various resolutions and declarations adopted against South Africa had been a stern warning to South Africa and had brought encouragement to the South African people; all that remained was to persuade certain Western Powers to rally to the majority. The General Assembly, in its resolutions, had requested the Special Committee to intensify its work; the Special Committee was aware of the magnitude of its task and was determined to bring every effort to bear on it.

39. The CHAIRMAN announced that Uganda had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.257.

40. Mr. AL-JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) emphasized how important it was to organize concerted trade union action against *apartheid* at the national and international level. His delegation, a sponsor of the draft resolution just introduced, welcomed the successful conclusion of negotiations with workers and trade union organizations, which was due in great part to the efforts of the former and current Chairmen of the Special Committee. In the second addendum (A/8722/Add.2) to its report, the Special Committee described the agreement which had been reached with the Workers' Group and the ILO as a result of the negotiations which a delegation of the Special Committee had held with the trade union organizations at Geneva. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the recommendations

aimed at ensuring that members of trade union organizations struggling for freedom would participate in the Conference. With a view to selecting those representatives who knew most about the plight of the African workers, the selection would be made in consultation with OAU, and the mission of the Special Committee which would travel to Geneva in February 1973 would certainly take that necessity into account. His delegation hoped that the financial arrangements which the participation of southern African trade union representatives in the Conference involved would create no difficulties.

41. It was apparent from paragraph 6 of the second addendum to the report of the Special Committee that the Workers' Group of the ILO wished to see other trade union organizations involved in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference. In that connexion, his delegation stressed that the Conference would be first and foremost a conference of trade unions and that the trade union organizations should so far as possible, be allowed to take their own decisions on the matter.

42. His delegation hoped that the United Nations and the ILO would assist the trade union movement in realizing the noble underlying aim of the conference, namely, to achieve the speedy liquidation of *apartheid* in South Africa and wherever it existed.

43. Mr. GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia), Mr. FOUNGUI (Congo), Mr. TARCICI (Yemen), Mr. SAO (Cameroon) and Mr. HAIBA (Mauritania) asked to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, who had already been joined by Algeria, Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mali, Romania, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/SPC/L.257, as well as draft resolution A/SPC/L.258, relating to agenda item 42, would be put to the vote after the closure of the debate on that item.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.